

August 3, 1999

important educational benefits for the visitors but also provides important economic benefits to Colorado.

So, ending this program would be bad for Colorado, and something that I can't support. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT,
FINANCING, AND RELATED PRO-
GRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT,
2000

SPEECH OF

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the Moakley amendment to H.R. 2606, Foreign Operations Appropriations for FY2000.

The Moakley amendment would prohibit funding for the United States Army School of the Americas (SOA) located in Fort Benning, GA—a school which has produced some of the most notorious human rights violators in Latin America. Currently \$20 million of the U.S. taxpayers money goes to train approximately 2,000 Latin American soldiers in military techniques, ostensibly to advance respect for civil authority and human rights.

Supporters of the SOA claim this school is a key foreign policy tool for the U.S. in Latin America and the Caribbean, helping to shape the region's leadership in ways favorable to American interests. They assert that the school has played a constructive role in promoting democracy in Latin America over the last decade; in reducing the flow of illicit drugs to the United States; and in emphasizing respect for human rights and civilian control of the military through their academic curriculum.

In fact, the SOA has repeatedly proven its disregard for human rights and democratic values.

In a school professing to advance democratic values and human rights, only 15 percent of the courses offered relate to these subjects. Less than 10 percent of the student body enroll in these courses. Only 8 percent of students enroll in the counter-narcotics course in any given year. Dozens of those who have taken this course have been tied to drug trafficking.

With the help of courses such as "Methods of Torture" and "Murder 101," the SOA has produced apt pupils. When six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper, and her daughter were murdered on November 16, 1989 in El Salvador, 19 of the 26 implicated in the murders were graduates of the SOA. Two of the three officers responsible for the assassination of pacifist Archbishop Romero went to the SOA. The officer who commanded the massacre of 30 defenseless peasants in the Colombian village of Mapiripan graduated from the SOA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Panamanian dictator and drug kingpin Manuel Antonio Noriega is one of the SOA's distinguished alumni.

These atrocious examples of terror and violence exhibit the extent to which the SOA has violated human rights and undermined democratic values throughout the Western hemisphere. Clearly, officers who attended SOA are not spreading American values of peace and democracy throughout Latin America.

It is not in American interests to continue support for the U.S. Army School of the Americas. For the sake of human rights and democracy, I urge my colleagues to support the Moakley amendment to end funding for the SOA.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT
FINANCING, AND RELATED PRO-
GRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT,
2000

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Operations Appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000 that was reported by the appropriations subcommittee, was a fair and bipartisan bill, given the tight funding restrictions.

Although the subcommittee's allocation of \$12.8 million was \$2.7 million below the FY 1999 funding level, I am pleased that the panel included increases in critical programs such as, the Child Survival Account and the Assistance for Displaced and Orphaned and Children Account within U.S.A.I.D. These programs provide critically needed assistance to sick, needy, and orphaned children in developing countries.

I would like to thank Chairman SONNY CALAHAN and Ranking Member NANCY PELOSI for including \$34 million, for the U.S. Agency for International Development's Collaborative Research Support Programs—a 100% increase over last year's funding. This program utilizes our leading universities, including the University of California, to help developing countries make improvements in agriculture. Supporting agricultural research is critical because we know that political stability is largely dependent on a developing country's ability to maintain a stable food supply. The Collaborative Research Support Program helps developing countries achieve this goal, thereby furthering our own interests as well as theirs.

However, despite the increases in these valuable programs, I must strongly object to the \$200 million that was cut from the World Bank's International Development Association at the direction of the Republican leadership. Cutting funds from this multilateral development program sends a message to other member-countries that the U.S. believes it is

19309

O.K. to shirk one's responsibility to developing countries. We should not send this message.

I object, not only to the substance of this cut, but also to the manner in which this cut was made. As I previously stated, the bill reported out of subcommittee was a fair, bipartisan bill. Unfortunately, the continuing insistence of the Republican leadership to make last minute cuts to our appropriations bills during full committee and House floor consideration has sorely undermined what should be a bi-partisan process.

Not providing responsible levels of funding for our government programs not only hurts our country, but results in increased emergency spending in the long run. While I will vote in favor of the bill in order to move the process along, it is my hope that the Republican leadership will recognize the shortsightedness of this strategy and restore this bill and others to their original funding levels.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT
FINANCING, AND RELATED PRO-
GRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT,
2000

SPEECH OF

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the United States is the world's largest trader. Our exports directly support almost 12 million U.S. jobs and have accounted for 30 percent of the U.S. economic growth over the past decade. With 94 percent of the world's population and the fastest-growing markets all located overseas, there is no question that U.S. exports are key to our nation's economic success and future.

Competition for these growing markets is fierce, and competitive financing is often the critical element to winning sales for U.S. goods and services. It is therefore crucial to our nation's interest to preserve and strengthen U.S. export finance and the Export-Import Bank to provide the foundation and means for expanding overseas trade.

In FY 1998, the Bank supported \$13 billion in exports that otherwise may not have been sold. These sales have sustained tens of thousands of well-paying jobs here in the United States. Furthermore, the Bank is working to help U.S. exporters maintain a foothold in countries like South Korea and Brazil, which are suffering difficulties yet still offer important opportunities for exporters.

The Ex-Im Bank is also an important source of assistance to small businesses to sell their products overseas. Each year, the Bank services about 2,000 new small business transactions, and is involved in more than 10,000 small business transactions.

Although the overall funding for the Bank was reduced by \$1 million, the Committee did

approve a crucial \$5 million increase in the Bank's Administrative budget that will enable the Bank to modernize their computer systems and to insert personnel into key markets to help American businesses sell overseas. This modernization is absolutely necessary at this time to ensure that the Bank is Y2K compliant. New systems and personnel will also help the bank reduce turn-around time on decisions for both small and large U.S. exporters.

The gentleman's amendment would prohibit the Bank, as well and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Trade Development Agency, from entering into any new obligations. This extremely dangerous amendment plays right into the hands of our European and Asian competitors, who will not cease to subsidize and finance the deals that their companies make simply because we will have chosen to do so; rather, this amendment will make it even more difficult for American exporters to compete in the combative worldwide marketplace, cutting U.S. jobs in the process.

This amendment may save a few dollars, but I assure my colleagues that the costs in lost exports and lost jobs far outweigh any savings we may incur. I urge my colleagues to fight to preserve American jobs and vote against this amendment.

IN SUPPORT FOR THE PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1999

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, today I am signing the discharge petition for the purpose of forcing floor consideration of the Patient's Bill of Rights.

I have held back from this action before this time out of my expectation the House Speaker would have brought this issue—if not this bill—forward before the August recess.

I am disappointed the majority leadership has broken its commitment to have House action on this matter this week. The Senate has acted. The American people want Congress to act. Because the indefinite House delay is irresponsible and very unfortunate I am signing the discharge petition. I hope all minority members who have yet to sign will join me in this action. I further hope that we will be joined by a sufficient number of Republicans who understand that it is time to act, in order to finally force House action on this issue.

EXPLANATION OF OMNIBUS LONG- TERM HEALTH CARE ACT OF 1999

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Representative MARKEY and I have introduced the Omnibus Long-Term Health Care Act of 1999. We are joined by Representatives MCGOVERN, MCDERMOTT, MOAKLEY, OLVER, CAPUANO, and GORDON.

The following is a detailed outline of the provisions of this legislation. We invite members of the House to join us in cosponsoring this legislation. We invite the public to suggest refinements and additions to the legislation to make it more comprehensive, workable, and effective legislation to help the millions of Americans facing the problems of obtaining quality long-term health care.

TITLE I: LONG-TERM CARE GIVER TAX CREDIT

Title I of the bill provides a \$1000 tax credit similar to the one described by the President in his State of the Union address. Our proposal has several notable differences. First, our tax credit is completely refundable, and there is no distinction between care for an adult or a child. If the credit is not refundable, it will fail to help those families in greatest need of help.

To be honest, \$1000 is not that much money for long-term care, but it does provide a family with modest relief that they can use as they see fit. That is why we have structured the bill to ensure that those who most need the support will receive the refund.

Another important distinction between our proposal and the President's is the treatment of children with long term care needs. The President's proposal would limit the tax credit to \$500 for children with long term care needs. We do not agree with this policy. The long-term care needs of a disabled child are just as expensive and emotionally and troubling as they are for an adult.

Our legislation also has a broader definition of individuals with long-term care needs. The President's proposal includes individuals who require assistance in to perform activities of daily living (bathing, dressing, eating, continence, toileting, and transferring in and out of a bed or chair). This is a good start but does not include people with severe mental health disabilities or developmental disabilities who cannot live independently.

Finally, our legislation limits the amount of the refund for the wealthy, not the poor. In our bill, reductions in the refund begin at the upper income levels, not the lower income levels. The full refund is available up to income of \$110,000 for a joint return, \$75,000 for an individual return, and \$55,000 for a married individual filing a separate return. Above these levels, the refund is decreased by \$50 by every \$1,000 over the threshold level.

TITLE II: LONG-TERM CARE MEDICARE IMPROVEMENTS

Title II of the legislation addresses a range of reforms and improvements to Medicare benefits. The goal of this title is to provide adequate long-term coverage to patients with chronic health care needs. We believe that we can adjust Medicare benefits so that people can continue to live in their homes and communities, and enjoy the contact with their families and friends. These proposals are cost effective as they rely on services in facilities other than hospitals and skilled nursing facilities, and allow people to continue to live in familiar surroundings with their family.

1. LONG-TERM HOME HEALTH AIDE BENEFITS

The first section extends Medicare Home Health Aid-Type services to chronically dependent individuals. This section establishes a new "long-term" home health benefit to maintain people with chronic conditions at home

rather than in more expensive settings. Many people can no longer take care of themselves because physical or mental disabilities impair their ability to perform basic activities of daily living (ADLs), including eating, bathing, dressing, toileting, transferring in and out of a bed or chair, and continence. These are activities that we all take for granted. The inability to do any of these independently is distressing for the patient and a clear indication of the extent of the impairment.

This provision allows individuals who suffer from a chronic physical or mental condition that impairs two or more ADLs to receive in-home care. To help contain costs, the provision would require competitive bidding of these services.

2. ADULT DAY CARE

The second section of this title's reforms is a provision for Medicare Substitute Adult Day Care Services. This provision would incorporate the adult day care setting into the current Medicare home health benefit. The provision allows beneficiaries to substitute any portion of their Medicare home health services for care in an adult day care center (ADC). Adult day care centers provide effective alternatives to complete confinement at home. Many States have used Medicaid funding to take advantage of ADCs for their patients.

For many, the ADC setting is superior to traditional home health care. The ADC can provide skilled therapy like the home health provider. In addition, the ADC also provides rehabilitation activities and means for the patients. Similarly, the ADCs provide a social setting within a therapeutic environment to serve patients with a variety of needs.

To achieve cost-savings, the ADC would be paid a flat rate of 95% of the rate that would have been paid for the service had it been delivered in the patient's home. The care would include the home health benefit and transportation, meals and supervised activities. As an added budget neutrality measure, the title allows the Secretary of Health and Human Services to lower the payment rate for ADC services if growth in those services is greater than current projections under the traditional home health program.

This program is not an expansion of the home health benefit. It would not make any new people eligible for the Medicare home health benefit. Nor would it expand the definition of what qualifies for reimbursement by Medicare for home health services. This legislation recognizes that ADCs can provide the same services, at lower costs, than traditional home care. Furthermore, the legislation recognizes the benefits of social interaction, activities, meals, and a therapeutic environment in which trained professionals can treat, monitor, and support patients.

The legislation also includes important quality and anti-fraud protections. In order to participate in the Medicare home care program, ADCs must meet the same standards set for home health agencies. The only exception is that the ADCs would not be required to be "primarily" involved in the provision of skilled nursing services and therapy services. The exception recognizes that ADCs provide services to an array of patients and that skilled nursing services and therapy services are not their primary activity.